

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

CATHY WOODS,

Plaintiff,

V.

CITY OF RENO, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:16-cv-00494-MMD-DJA

ORDER

12 Presently before the Court is Defendants City of Reno and Lawrence C. Dennison's
13 Amended Motion to Seal (ECF No. 220), filed on February 14, 2020. Plaintiff filed a Response
14 (ECF No. 221) on February 17, 2020. Also before the Court is the Joint Stipulation to Seal (ECF
15 No. 222), filed on February 17, 2020, along with the Notice re Withdrawal of Motion to File
16 Exhibits 2-16 and 18-19 Under Seal (ECF No. 223), filed on February 17, 2020.

17 The Court previously denied without prejudice Defendants' request to file portions of
18 their summary judgment briefing under seal for failure to meet the appropriate standard for
19 sealing court filings. (ECF No. 219). It ordered the parties to renew their request supported by
20 appropriate points and authority by February 17, 2020 or it would unseal all documents subject to
21 the prior deficient motion to seal. (*Id.*).

22 The parties reached a stipulation to seal Plaintiff's medical records filed at Exhibits 1-17
23 of ECF No. 216 and Exhibit 10 of ECF No. 206. (ECF No. 222). The Court has reviewed the
24 grounds for maintaining those records under seal as confidential medical records and finds the
25 Ninth Circuit's directives in *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir.
26 2006) and *Center for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Group, LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1097 (9th Cir. 2016) to
27 be satisfied. It will maintain the seal on those records under the compelling reasons standard.

1 Plaintiff opposes only Defendants' renewed request to seal Exhibits 1-1.39 of ECF No.
2 206 specifically because she does not believe Defendants have met the standard for sealing the
3 entire Reno Police Department investigative file. (ECF No. 221). Defendants argue Exhibit 1 is
4 nearly 4,000 pages that contains social security numbers of witnesses and subjects, personal
5 information that may not be revealed without violating Nevada law, confidential juvenile justice
6 information, and thus, cannot be redacted sufficiently for the Court's review in connection with
7 the motion for summary judgment. The Court is persuaded that Defendants have met the
8 compelling reasons standard for sealing given the types of records contained in Exhibit 1 and fact
9 that filing an unredacted version or even an incomplete version would not permit the Court to
10 properly evaluate the motion for summary judgment. As such, it will maintain the seal on Exhibit
11 1.

12 Defendants withdrew the prior request to seal Exhibits 2-16 and 18-19 (ECF No. 223) and
13 filed an amended version with redactions (ECF No. 224). Defendants also withdrew their request
14 to file Exhibit 36 (ECF No. 215) under seal and filed a redacted version (ECF No. 220-1). Given
15 that the redacted versions were filed at ECF Nos. 220-1 and 224, the Court will strike Exhibits 2-
16 16 and 18-19 from ECF No. 216 and Exhibit 36 from ECF No. 215.

17 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendants City of Reno and Lawrence C.
18 Dennison's Amended Motion to Seal (ECF No. 220) is **granted**.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Joint Stipulation to Seal (ECF No. 222) is **granted**.

20 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall strike Exhibits 2-16 and 18-
21 19 from ECF No. 216 and Exhibit 36 from ECF No. 215 and maintain the seal on all currently
22 sealed exhibits.

23 DATED: February 19, 2020

24
25 
26 DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
28